

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-17, 19-23, 25 and 27-49 are pending, with Claims 1, 6-10, 15, 19 and 27 amended, and Claims 5 and 18 canceled by the present amendment.

In the Official Action of June 30, 2006, Claims 1-10, 12-23, 25 and 27-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawai (U.S. Patent 6,137,485) in view of Comstock (*sic* U.S. Patent 5,692,073).

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the telephone interview between the Examiner and Applicants' representative on October 24, 2006 in which the Examiner acknowledged that the Official Action contains a typographical error and that Comstock should be identified as U.S. Patent 6,704,769 not U.S. Patent 5,692,073.

Claims 1 and 15 are amended to recite the features of cancelled Claims 5 and 18, respectively. Claim 27 is also amended to recite the features of cancelled Claim 18. Claims 6-10 and 19 are amended for antecedent basis. No new matter is added.

Claim 1 is directed to a system for managing video teleconferencing devices configured to exchange audio/video data. The system includes a management adapter (Fig. 1, item 14) accessible to a user interface (Fig. 1, item 12), the management adapter having a list that identifies the video teleconferencing devices configured to exchange audio/video data, and a device access layer (Fig. 1, item 26) interfaced with the management adapter and the video teleconferencing devices. The device access layer represents the video teleconferencing devices as objects to support management of the video teleconferencing devices through the management adapter during set-up or conduct of an active video teleconference (Specification, page 13, lines 15-17). The video teleconferencing devices have plural video teleconferencing types, the device access layer representing each type of

video teleconferencing device as an object class (Specification, page 13, lines 17-24; see also page 13, line 29 – page 14, line 10). Claim 15 is directed to a method substantially corresponding to the apparatus recited in Claim 1. Claim 27 is directed to an alternative embodiment of the method of Claim 15.

Dependent Claim 2 recites that the device access layer represents the video teleconferencing devices as Management Beans. A Management Bean is a JAVA software construct (Specification, page 14, line 11 – page 15, line 11; see also item 60 of Fig. 3B). Claims 3, 4, 12, 13, 14, 16, 20, 23, 32 and 44 also recite Management Beans.

Claim 20 is directed to a method for interfacing an SNMP management application with plural video teleconferencing devices having disparate native interface protocols. The method includes representing each video teleconferencing device as a Management Bean stored on a server (Specification, page 15, lines 27-30; see also Figs. 2-3), providing an SNMP management instruction for a video teleconferencing device to an SNMP adapter (Specification, page 17, lines 1-17; see also Figs. 2-3), communicating the SNMP management instruction using the SNMP adapter as a management bean client in communication with the server (Specification, page 17, lines 1-17; see also Figs. 2-3), and communicating the SNMP management instruction from the server through the management bean representing the video teleconferencing device to the video teleconferencing device in a native protocol of the device (Specification, page 17, lines 1-17; see also Figs. 2-3), and sending audio/video data from one of said plural video teleconferencing devices to another of said plural video teleconferencing devices (Fig. 3). Claim 25 is directed to a system substantially corresponding to the method of Claim 20, albeit without recitation of Management Beans.

Claim 36 is directed to a system for managing a video network having plural video teleconferencing devices. The system includes plural objects, each object having attributes to

represent a video teleconferencing network device, one or more lists of the attributes, one or more MIB having variables of the video teleconferencing network device (Specification, page 20, lines 9-28; Fig. 4 items 68, 70, 72, 76 and 78), and a MIB summation engine (Fig. 4, item 66) operational to select one or more attributes and one or more variables to dynamically create a MIB (Fig. 4, item 80; specification page 20, line 19 – page 22, line 22) for the video teleconferencing device during set-up or conduct of an active video teleconference. Claim 45 is directed to a method substantially corresponding to the system of Claim 36.

The first issue is whether Kawai or Comstock disclose or suggest a device access layer representing each type of video teleconferencing device as an object class as recited in Claims 1, 15 and 27.

The second issue is whether Kawai or Comstock disclose a management bean as recited in Claims 2, 3, 4, 12, 13, 14, 16, 20, 23, 32 and 44.

The third issue is whether Kawai or Comstock disclose or suggest an SNMP management instruction for a video teleconferencing device as recited in Claims 20 and 25.

The fourth issue is whether Kawai or Comstock disclose an MIB having variables of a video teleconferencing device or a MIB summation engine operational to select one or more attributes and one or more variables to dynamically create a MIB as recited in independent Claims 36 and 45.

- A. Kawai and Comstock each fail to disclose or suggest a device access layer representing each *type* of video teleconferencing device as an object *class* as recited in Claims 1, 15 and 27.

Kawai discloses a variety of methods for remotely controlling cameras in a video teleconference, and providing an indication on a variety of video conference terminals for which terminal is controlling which camera. In Figure 3 of Kawai, reference numeral 60 denotes an observer list field for displaying a list of observers who are observing the image picked up by the video camera 30 and transmitted onto the network 12. The list field 60

displays the login name of the communication terminal of each observer. If there are a plurality of observers, the list field 60 displays a list of the login names of all of the observers. Reference numeral 62 denotes an operator field for displaying the name of an operator who is remote controlling the camera 30 at present.¹ Kawai also discloses an access management process 78 that manages the remote control operations and image distribution operations of cameras 30 of all the video communications terminals 10-1, 10-2, 10-3 and 10-4 connected to the network 12. As acknowledged in the Official Action, Kawai does not disclose or suggest the use of objects. To cure this deficiency, the Official Action cites Comstock.

Comstock discloses a system apparatus and method for managing media in a multimedia conferencing system according to media roles. Examples of media roles include “people” or “content.” Page 2 of the Official Action asserts that Figure 1 of Comstock teaches the representation of devices as objects. Applicants traverse and note that Figure 1 is merely a diagram of a variety of devices connected to a network. The Official Action also cites column 3, lines 20-55 of Comstock. However, this citation also fails to disclose an object or any other type of control device or schema. This section of Comstock merely describes what types of devices may be connected together via a network, but does not disclose or suggest classifying devices as objects in software, let alone by object type.

While not cited in the Official Action or Advisory Action, Applicants contend that the only possible portion of Comstock that might be remotely relevant to Applicants’ claimed invention is the portion that describes call manager 135 and policy manager 136.² The call manager 135 of Comstock merely implements well known video conferencing functionalities such as call initiation (using the H245 control protocol), codec selection and the like. The call manager 135 does not deal with “objects”.

¹ Kawai, column 4, lines 38-50.

² Comstock, column 8, line 66 through column 10, line 16.

Policy manager 136 operates to coordinate connection establishment and termination and may operate to control a video conferencing according to one or more policies. In general policies any rule, algorithm or combination or collection of rules and algorithms that may be applied to media streams in a video conference. This may include rules and algorithms that relate to assigning roles to media streams, as well as rules and algorithms that relate to handling media streams according to assigned roles. The policy manager 136 implements a policy for displaying media stream bearing labels according to roles (people or content). The policy manager may permit a user to select, through a user interface 138, any number of people to display through a people display 154 and may allow the user to select specific participants for display. The policy manager may allow for establishment of a picture-in-picture display. The policy manager 136 may also require that only one content source may be selected at a certain time. The policy manager may further require that all participating terminals display content on their own local content displays.

To manage the various policies, tokens are used to identify and control which terminal plays which role. Figure 3 of Comstock is a state diagram of token management by an arbitrating multipoint conference unit. In step 200, the system is initialized. At step 202 a token holder variable is set to NONE, indicating that no participant in the video conference currently holds the token. When a request 208 is received for the token, the process transmits an acknowledgement 210 of the request 208 and sets the token holder variable to the requesting terminal as shown in step 212. At some point, the process may receive a request 224 for the token while the process is in a token held state 214. If request 224 is from the current token holder an acknowledgement is transmitted 210 and the token holder variable is again set to the requester 212. If the request 224 is not from the current token holder, the process continues to step 228 where a withdraw request is transmitted to the token holder.³

³ Comstock, column 10, line 17 through column 11, line 45.

Figure 4 of Comstock is a flowchart showing a process for initiating a video conference and uses roles according to the previously described concepts. After capabilities are exchanged and the logical channel is established, as shown in step 310, selected sources are coded and labeled. Source streams are coded using any suitable codex identified during the capability exchange. The streams are labeled according to the established or predetermined policy. A number of labels may be defined in an 8-bit label definition. The label may include designations of known media roles, for example 000: people; 001: content; 010: mixed; 011: any; and 100-111: reserved. These labels may be applied to media when the media is created. A media stream may be relabeled during use.

However, the tokens of Comstock are only concerned with labeling displays of various media streams, and are not related to managing equipment via corresponding object-representations. However, assuming *arguendo* the classification of media streams into people or content types is creating objects, the media stream classification of Comstock is not “representing each *type* of video teleconferencing device as an object *class*” as recited in Claim 1 or “dividing the video teleconferencing devices into *types* of video teleconferencing devices” or “establishing an object *class* for each *type* of video teleconferencing device” as recited in independent Claims 15 and 27. That is, the streams of Comstock are not labeled differently if they are related to an MCU, (a first type of video device) endpoint (a second type of video device) or other videoconferencing apparatus (a third type of video device). In fact, such a labeling would be nonsensical on Comstock.

B. Kawai and Comstock each fail to disclose a management bean as disclosed in Claims 2, 3, 4, 12, 13, 14, 16, 20, 23, 32 and 44.

A Management Bean is a JAVA software construct (Specification, page 14, line 11 – page 15, line 11; see also item 60 of Fig. 3B). Page 3 of the Official Action states that column 5, lines 1-20 of Comstock discloses Applicants’ claimed management bean. Applicants traverse and note that this portion of Comstock merely describes that rack 10 may

include different hardware or software devices used in video teleconferences. A rack is, as shown in the corresponding figure, a cabinet and is not a Java Management Bean. Both a Real Networks compatible G2 encoder/streamer and a Windows Media codec are hardware/software interface devices, and are not inherently related to Java Management Beans. Similarly a generic directory server, conference scheduler, database server, authentication server, and a billing/metering system are not inherently related to Java Management Beans. A review of the entirety of Comstock (and Kawai) reveal no reference to Java Management Beans, or any other Java construct.

C. Kawai and Comstock each fail to disclose or suggest an SNMP management instruction for a video teleconferencing device as recited in Claims 20 and 25.

Kawai and Comstock each fail to disclose or suggest any sort of SNMP instructions, let alone providing a) an SNMP management instruction for a video teleconferencing device to an SNMP adapter; b) communicating the SNMP management instruction using the SNMP adapter as a management bean client in communication with the server; and c) communicating the SNMP management instruction from the server through the management bean representing the video teleconferencing device to the video teleconferencing device in a native protocol of the device as recited in Claim 20. Similarly, Kawai and Comstock each fail to disclose or suggest an adapter in communication with the application to accept SNMP instructions from the application for a video teleconferencing device; and an agent in communication with the adapter, the agent representing the video teleconferencing device as an object having attributes, wherein the adapter and agent cooperate to convert the SNMP instructions to the native protocol with the video teleconferencing device object attributes translated into requests to the video teleconferencing device in a native protocol of the video teleconferencing device during set-up or conduct of an active video teleconference, as recited

in Claim 25. Indeed, the Official Action provides no indication where these features may be found in the applied references.

- D. Kawai and Comstock each fail to disclose or suggest “a MIB having variables of a video teleconferencing device” or “an MIB summation engine operational to select one or more attributes and one or more variables to dynamically create a MIB” as recited in independent Claims 36 and 45.

Kawai and Comstock each fail to disclose or suggest any sort of MIB or MIB summation engine, let alone one or more MIB having variables of a video teleconferencing network device; and a MIB summation engine operational to select one or more attributes and one or more variables to dynamically create a MIB for the video teleconferencing device during set-up or conduct of an active video teleconference as recited in Claim 36. Similarly Kawai and Comstock each fail to disclose or suggest dynamically creating a MIB for the video teleconferencing network device from selected attributes of the object associated with the video network device; and accessing the dynamically created MIB with the SNMP application to manage the video teleconferencing network device as recited in Claim 45.

MPEP §706.02(j) notes that to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Also, the teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on Applicants’ disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir.1991). Without addressing the first two prongs of the test of obviousness, Applicants submit that Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-17, 19-23, 25 and 27-49 are not *prima facie* obvious because both Kawai and Comstock fail to disclose the above-discussed features of Applicants’ independent and dependent claims.

Accordingly, in view of the present amendment and in light of the previous discussion, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request an early and favorable action to that effect.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 03/06)

MM/rac

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle

Attorney of Record

Registration No. 40,073

Michael E. Monaco

Registration No. 52,041

I:\ATTY\MM\263556US-AM_RCE.DOC